



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

RECENT CASES.

BENEFICIAL ASSOCIATION—MEMBERS—REQUIREMENTS—WAIVER OF FORFEITURE.—*MOERSCHBAECHER v. ROYAL LEAGUE*, 59 N. E. 17 (Ill.).—The by-laws of a benefit association provided that any member who engaged in the saloon business should forfeit his beneficial rights. Although the association received his dues knowing decedent's business, the court *held* that the beneficiary could not recover.

The decision of the appellate court, which is here affirmed, in declaring that there was no waiver of the right of forfeiture, seems contrary to the best authority. Forfeitures are not favored in law, and conditions limiting or avoiding liability are strictly construed against the insurer and liberally in favor of the assured. *Ins. Co. v. Young*, 86 Ala. 421; *Ins. Co. v. Raddin*, 120 U. S. 123. In principle at least, also, this decision is contrary to *Ins. Co. v. Hick*, 125 Ill. 361. See *Supreme Court of Honor v. Sullivan*, 59 N. E. 37 (Ind.).

COLLISION ON HIGHWAY—SERVANTS—SCOPE OF AUTHORITY.—*PERLSTEIN v. AM. EXP. CO.*, 59 N. E. Rep. 194 (Mass.).—A servant driving his master's team deviated from his prescribed course and negligently collided with a vehicle. *Held*, the master was not liable for the damage.

Though in general the master is liable for an injury caused by a tool placed in his servant's hands, as shown in *Southwick v. Estes*, 7 Cush. 385, yet this rule here succumbs to the fact that the servant was acting beyond the scope of his authority. *Bowler v. O'Connell*, 162 Mass. 319; *Davis v. Houghtelin*, 33 Neb. 582.

CONTRACTS—RECISSION—RESTORATION OF CONSIDERATION.—*YAPLE v. NEW YORK O. & W. CO.*, 68 N. Y. Supp. 292.—In an action for injuries to the person and property of the plaintiff, defendants having pleaded a release, the trial judge ruled that plaintiff could not properly reply that such release was procured by deceit, and assert that he did not know that he was signing a release for personal injuries and that the release was only signed for injuries to the property, without offering to restore the consideration. *Held*, this ruling was incorrect.

It is a general rule that a party who seeks to rescind a contract into which he has been induced to enter by fraud must restore to the other party whatever he has received by virtue of the contract. *Cobb v. Hatfield*, 46 N. Y. 533. But this rule applies to those cases only where that which was received and must be returned was the consideration or settlement which the receiver intended to make, and understood he was making, and which he seeks to avoid by reason of fraudulent practices of the other party which led him to agree to its terms. *Bliss v. Railroad Co.*, 160 Mass. 447; *Mullen v. Old Colony Railroad Co.*, 127 Mass. 86.